

**Editorials in Favor of Statewide Smokefree Air  
Media Coverage Report**

<b>Media Outlet</b>	<b>Circulation</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Title</b>
<i>Oakland Business Review</i>	16,000	3/29/07	"Smoking ban a no-brainer"
<i>The Greenville Daily News</i>	8,398	3/28/07	"If it's public, then it should be smoke-free"
<i>Ludington Daily News</i>	8,735	3/2/07	N/A
<i>Niles Daily Star</i>	1,970	3/2/07	"Was county's smoking ban really worth the effort"
<i>Detroit Free Press</i>	328,628	2/27/07	"Michigan should get with times and ban smoking in public places"
<i>Petoskey News-Review</i>	18,000	2/19/07	"Our stand on smoking: snuff 'em out!"
<i>The Saginaw News</i>	43,120	1/24/07	"Smoke-Free Michigan"
<i>The Flint Journal</i>	83,553	11/13/06	"No Smoking, Period"
<i>Port Huron Times Herald</i>	27,707	10/2/06	"Hospitals take hard line on smoking habit - total ban sends right message"
<i>Muskegon Chronicle</i>	42,762	5/7/06	"As we see it"

## In Our Opinion **Smoking ban a no-brainer**

Butt out smokers. That's the message Michigan residents appear to be sending if results of recent polling data are accurate.

A survey by Lansing PR firm The Rossman Group, conducted by Denno-Noor Research in partnership with Michigan Information and Research Services, shows a majority of Michigan voters have just about had it with smoking in public buildings — and that includes bars and restaurants.

We're not surprised Michigan residents are giving a big thumbs-down to smokers in public places. Breathing clean air is tops on just about everyone's list.

In the past 20 years there's been a huge shift in public attitudes about smoking. Fewer and fewer of our colleagues at work smoke and many of us are less tolerant about inhaling side stream smoke when we're in public places. It's amazing to recall the days when smoking was allowed on most major airlines.

When health and education are top priorities, there's not much room for smoke in public buildings.

Clipping provided by:

**John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.**  
Public Relations

# Greenville Daily News

March 28, 2007

## If it's public, then it should be smoke-free

It's a most unpleasant experience – coming home stinking of smoke because the place you just spent time in reeked like a chimney. This area has an abundance of such establishments – locations to avoid because they're filled with cigar or cigarette smoke. Many nonsmokers can recite a list of places they won't go because clothes must be laundered as soon as they arrive home.

That isn't the case in many communities throughout the nation. Michigan joins Alabama, Iowa, Louisiana, New Hampshire, the Carolinas, Tennessee, and Virginia as the only states with absolutely no smoking regulations.

On the other hand, the majority of states forbid smoking in public places. If it works for our neighbors, what's the matter with us?

The evidence is right there in front of our faces that secondhand smoke is just as bad as if you're smoking yourself. The same goes for being in the same room with a smoker or smokers.

It only takes one or two people lighting up in a large space such as a bowling alley, restaurant or bar to make everyone miserable.

That's why we believe in this credo – if it's open to the public, then it should be smoke-free.

The Mid Michigan District Health department's recent call for a countywide smoking ban was a step in the right direction, minus the exceptions for restaurants and bars. We'd like to see it implemented countywide for all public places

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.

Public Relations

**Niles Daily Star**  
March 2, 2007

**Editorials**

Was county's smoking ban really worth the effort?

We applaud the effort by the Berrien County Health Department and the decision by the Berrien County Commission to ban smoking in public places in our county.

However, we're left to wonder if the move, which brought out many strong opinions on both sides of the issue, was worth the effort.

The smoking ban approved Thursday night in Niles really amounts to very little. It prohibits smoking in public places and private businesses. But because of a law passed by the Michigan legislature, municipalities can't limit smoking in bars and restaurants in Michigan.

Aren't those places exactly where a ban on smoking is needed?

Most private businesses have banned smoking in the workplace already. Business owners and managers learned long ago about the ill effects of smoking on computer equipment, other inventory and the health and productivity of their workers - those who smoke and who don't.

Most government offices already ban smoking by employees and the public.

So what's left? That question becomes more relevant when you consider the smoking ban approved Thursday night by county leaders does nothing to stop those who walk outside to public sidewalks to smoke. It only pertains to "enclosed" public places.

Smoking is a nuisance and those who don't want to smoke shouldn't have it forced upon them. That's our right as citizens.

One opponent of the smoking ban who spoke during the public portion of the Thursday meeting in Niles asked, "What's next. Are you going to ban people from wearing hats."

Of course, it's not the same thing. His wearing of a hat does nothing to harm anyone else. On the other hand, smoking kills. That's beyond dispute. If an individual wants to smoke, who cares if they do so alone in the privacy of their own home or car. However, smokers have no right to inflict their toxic habit on others.

The meaningful step those who want to ban smoking should take is to lobby the state's legislature to change the ridiculous Michigan law that protects smoking in bars and restaurants.

That's the only move that will make a difference in our quality of life.

Clipping provided by:

**John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.**  
Public Relations

## Michigan should get with times and ban smoking in public places

*February 27, 2007*

Want to reduce health care costs in Michigan? Discourage smoking.

Where to start? With a statewide ban on smoking in restaurants and other public places. Right now, the state won't even let local governments do this. The public health code makes it a state issue. And, while half the American population is now covered by either state or local restrictions on smoking in public places -- even the French now have a law -- the Michigan Legislature has never even held a hearing on the issue.

Despite nearly a decade of setbacks in both houses of the Legislature, state Sen. Ray Basham, D-Taylor, has not been deterred. Once again last month, he introduced a smoke-free workplace bill that specifically prohibits smoking in public eateries. The Legislature ought to act, in the interest of public health -- and health care costs.

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.  
Public Relations

## Petoskey News Review

February 19, 2007

(Page 1 of 2)

### Our stand on smoking: snuff 'em out!

The News-Review editorial board has long taken the stance that smoking cigarettes is still a legal activity and that businesses, including restaurants and bars, are private operations which must be allowed to decide for themselves whether they'll permit smoking on their property.

Restaurant customers can choose non-smoking sections and non-smoking restaurants if they don't like the smoke wafting over their waffles or whitefish, we've always maintained.

After watching the debate for a decade, we've decided our stance has gone up in smoke. As opinions and attitudes have changed, so have our minds.

So, the time has come for Michigan to consider a smoking ban in restaurants, and (gasp) bars.

With the change in power in Lansing, legislation that was left to languish in Sen. Jason Allen's restaurant industry-friendly commerce committee is expected to get a new and deserved airing on the full floor of the Legislature. We have always believed that the issue of a smoking ban must be heard by all lawmakers and not stymied in committee.

Now that the times and climate have changed, this legislation may have a solid chance of passing. Smoking ban advocates say their push is getting more support and note that seven states, including next-door Ohio, enacted anti-smoking laws.

Twenty-six states now forbid smoking in bars, restaurants or workplaces. Nineteen have smoke-free restaurants and 13 have smoke-free bars - not including Chicago and other cities that have enacted their own bans. Entire countries, including Ireland, ban smoking from their pubs.

So it's not like backers are blowing smoke.

Nonsmoking sections simply do not work. Sure, they're better than sitting next to smokers but smoke drifts. Patrons are still exposed to smoke as they walk through the restaurant facilities, to use the restrooms or to enter and exit, etc.

U.S. Surgeon General Richard Carmona released a report last year that condemned secondhand smoke and said breathing any amount of someone else's tobacco smoke harms nonsmokers. He called for completely smoke-free buildings and public places, saying that separate smoking sections and ventilation systems don't fully protect nonsmokers.

The proposed ban is opposed by the Michigan Restaurant Association and the Michigan Licensed Beverage Association, which say restaurants and bars should be free to decide whether to allow smoking based on free-market competition without intrusion from government.

And that, until now, has been the New-Review's stance.

While it's almost impossible for us to picture a night out at the bar without the smoking that goes with it, other cities, states and nations prove it can be done, without patrons leaving in droves.

In fact, we find it absurd that Emmet and Charlevoix counties would ban smoking in almost all private work places, but not where the most smoking by far is being done - bars and restaurants.

Only fools and the cigarette industry argue that second-hand smoke isn't a health concern. We think the members of the Michigan Restaurant Association and the Michigan Licensed Beverage Association are simply too afraid of losing customers and much needed revenue during these troubling times.

Even if you buy into their fear, the arguments fail when considering the health of restaurant workers. They are totally unprotected from second-hand smoke and can't choose to serve only nonsmoking areas.

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.  
Public Relations

## Petoskey News Review

February 19, 2007

(Page 2 of 2)

The worries of business people are worthy of consideration. We absolutely don't want to minimize those concerns, but that they are outweighed by the reality we can see today.

What this change requires - what the public health demands - is an acceptance of the facts and a shift in our belief systems.

As any ex-smoker can tell you, a night out dining and a night out at the bar is not only possible without smoking a cigarette, but just as enjoyable. Better, if you consider you won't have to leave your clothing outdoors after a night out because of the stink.

Really. It's true.

Let's have the debate, and let's have a vote.

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.  
Public Relations

**Saginaw News**  
January 24, 2007

**Smoke-free Michigan**

**DELTA COLLEGE AND**

St. Mary's of Michigan have walked deeper into the smoke-free refuge.

Officials in Gratiot County are considering following Midland and Saginaw counties in banning smoking in most workplaces.

The momentum for smoking bans is growing stronger. Local governments increasingly are jumping aboard the clean air bandwagon. More states are enacting smoke-free laws that include bars and restaurants, which Michigan law exempts from local health regulations. This month, for instance, Illinois lawmakers began pushing for a statewide ban on smoking that extends to all public places. Sixteen states have similar laws.

Bans on smoking in public places have wide support, even from some smokers. The evidence is powerful that exposure to secondhand smoke is harmful and, increasingly, our institutions and governments are protecting the health of nonsmokers, who make up roughly 80 percent of the population. The libertarian arguments against laws banning smoking in public conveniently cloud the fact that breathing in secondhand smoke often isn't a choice. Smokers don't have a right to foul the air of others.

It's time for Michigan to enact a statewide ban on smoking in public places and snuff out the exemption for restaurants and taverns.

The evidence is overwhelming and the impact on health is indisputable.

Clipping provided by:

**John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.**  
Public Relations



The Flint Journal  
November 13, 2006

No smoking, period  
Case builds to make bars, restaurants tobacco-free

FLINT

THE FLINT JOURNAL FIRST EDITION

Monday, November 13, 2006

With last week's election, the political winds shifted in Michigan. Let's hope the change is enough to help clear the air of secondhand smoke in the state's bars and restaurants.

Past efforts to pass a smoking ban for these businesses stalled in the GOP-controlled Legislature, but Democrats will take control of the state House in January and Gov. Jennifer Granholm already has announced her support for this prohibition. As for the Republican-controlled Senate, a majority leader contender is the co-sponsor of a smoking ban bill pending in that body.

Lawmakers have more reason than ever to consider an all-out ban on smoking, or at least to allow local units of government to decide the matter for themselves. The Campaign for Smokefree Air - which includes such heavy hitters as the American Lung Association, the American Heart Association and the American Cancer Society - reports that the air in nonsmoking sections, contrary to what some might think, is unhealthy.

The group recently armed volunteers with small monitors and sent them into the eateries and bars in eight Michigan cities, including Flint. According to their findings, patrons sitting in nonsmoking sections were exposed to levels of toxins that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency deems unhealthy for "sensitive groups" of people.

Until recently, The Flint Journal's editorial stand was to leave the choice of whether to ban smoking to individual restaurant and bar owners. More than 4,000 establishments in Michigan have done so of their own free will. But the data have become too compelling, too overwhelming, to leave the decision in the hands of business owners. People's health, their very lives, are being put at risk. Each year in Michigan, 2,000 nonsmokers die from smoking-related illnesses.

Genesee County has done an excellent job of protecting nonsmokers' health. For nearly four years, the county has banned smoking in workplaces. Not only has the measure protected nonsmokers, it's prompted some smokers to kick the habit. The percentage of county residents who smoke dropped from about 27 percent in 2003 to 25.19 percent last year, a survey showed.

State statute, regrettably, prevents the county from forcing restaurants and bars to comply with the workplace measure. However, with the latest health evidence the case for repealing this law has become irrefutable.

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.  
Public Relations

# Port Huron Times Herald

October 2, 2006

## OUR VIEW

Staff  
Times Herald

Hospitals take hard line on smoking habit

Total ban sends right message

As of Jan. 1, St. Clair County's three leading hospitals will be completely smoke-free. Good for them. It is difficult to imagine hospitals, leaders of health care, would have tolerated designated smoking areas on their premises for this long. To be fair, the facilities have been smoke-free for years. To allow smoking outside, though, sends the wrong message - and that will end about three months from now. In announcing the new policy Friday, the presidents of Port Huron and Mercy hospitals and St. John River District Hospital in East China Township said two years of work were required to put it in effect. That shouldn't be much of a surprise.

Although health experts have long identified smoking as harmful to our health - its links to heart disease and cancer - cigarettes also are extremely addictive. It's easy to tell hospital visitors they can't smoke. It's another thing to tell that to hospital employees.

Yes, some hospital workers smoke. If anything, that fact illustrates how endemic the habit is to our society. Like any other smoker, they, too, need help to stop.

That's why the hospitals are providing cessation programs for employees who want to quit. Visitors who smoke will receive replacement therapies, such as lozenges that release nicotine as they dissolve in the mouth.

The hospitals' effort reminds us that America is in the throes of a revolution - and the goal is better health. It's worth reflecting on how far the movement has come. The 1955 film *Not As a Stranger* is instructive. The drama, about a doctor played by Robert Mitchum, showed hospitals in which personnel and patients routinely smoked. Today, that would be unthinkable.

America is struggling to ban smoking in all public venues. Bars and restaurants have become the principal battlefields. At least 50 St. Clair County restaurants are smoke-free.

The anti-smoking campaign, nationally and locally, is not easy. Smoking is a difficult habit to break. The hospitals' new policy might seem to some as a given, but it's far more significant. Health-care providers bear a special responsibility to lead this revolution. The truth is they are not immune from the reach of smoking.

One in three county residents smoke, said Dr. John Brooks, an infectious disease specialist who led the hospitals' effort to implement the smoking ban. More county residents die from smoking-related causes than automobile accidents - 330 in 2003.

It's time to draw the line. The hospitals are making that clear.

### FAST FACTS

#### SMOKING IN ST. CLAIR COUNTY

27% of adults older than 18 in St. Clair County reported daily tobacco use, compared to 23% of Michigan adults and 21% of U.S. adults.

About 332 St. Clair County people died of smoking-related diseases in 2003.

No one can smoke within 25 feet of any county government building.

There are at least 50 smoke-free restaurants in the county.

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.  
Public Relations

## Muskegon Chronicle

May 7, 2006

(Page 1 of 2)

### As We See It

Brookhaven stuck between a rock and a hard place The state of Michigan has come down hard — very hard — on Muskegon County's Brookhaven Medical Care Facility. We're not convinced that treatment is fair under the circumstances, and we are very concerned that Brookhaven's future may be endangered.

Hopefully, many readers are familiar with reporter Steve Gunn's April 23 in-depth stories on Brookhaven's troubles. What we all learned is that the county-run nursing home has been fined or otherwise financially penalized to the tune of \$350,000, an extraordinary sum for a facility that is currently running on a shoestring.

Not to minimize the infractions that led to the resulting action by the state, these were by no means the kind of nursing home horror stories one sometimes hears about occurring elsewhere. Certainly, whatever care deficiencies were cited affected the patient adversely, but there was absolutely no evidence of deliberate mistreatment or anything resembling it.

The lion's share of the penalties lodged against Brookhaven were in fact the result of a bureaucratic mistake that should have been avoided, and could have been avoided, in the admission of 14 new patients receiving Medicaid and Medicare before state authorities had lifted a ban on such admissions.

In consequence of all the above, the current administrator has announced his retirement, and county officials are seeking a purchaser for Brookhaven. And that's one of the brighter scenarios for this otherwise well-regarded facility.

Surely, there must be some avenue of appeal that can be taken to revisit Brookhaven's case. If there is, we urge local officials to seek it out.

### It's time to rethink public smoking Issue

This newspaper has long advocated letting owners of public facilities decide whether or not to allow smoking. This fits with our general dislike of "nanny" laws that purport to govern individual behavior. The Chronicle's editorial board has recently come to the conclusion that it's time to rethink our opposition to proposed anti-smoking laws, and that the state should, too.

Frankly, there is too much evidence on the side of public health to delay any further. Smoking kills people, and second-hand smoke kills people, too. That's it, plain and simple. It should be banned anywhere the public gathers — in restaurants, bars and casinos, among other places not already covered by anti-smoking regulations.

Here in Muskegon County, the work towards at least smoke-free restaurants is being advanced by Laketon Township resident Richard Mullally, whose letter on the subject appears on the page opposite. Mullally is one of many Michigan residents who have seen the light on the subject of smoking in public places and is trying to educate others about this very real problem — The Chronicle among them. One of the many factors that has caused us to change our position on this issue is the continuing spike of lung cancer deaths and

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.  
Public Relations

## Muskegon Chronicle

May 7, 2006

(Page 2 of 2)

Incidents of the disease both in our state and nationwide. Lung cancer, which is beyond the shadow of any argument the leading cause, is one of the deadliest forms of this disease. Once in the lungs, the cancer is liable to spread to any part of the body — and is sometimes discovered too late to treat.

Lung cancer is painful and a sad end for far too many. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in addition to smokers, about 38,000 nonsmokers die each year as the result of exposure to second-hand smoke. Among non-smokers who may have fallen victim was the courageous Dana Reeve, wife of the late Christopher "Superman" Reeve, whose heroism in the face of his full paralysis was inspiring to millions. Dana carried on his great work until she died of lung cancer this year.

Separating non-smoking from smoking areas in public facilities just doesn't cut it. Far too many have told us that if smoke is present, it bothers them. Sure, they have a choice not to do business at this or that restaurant, but really, do its employees have the same option? Not many do.

We urge our legislators to reconsider their positions on this issue as well. Second-hand smoke is too dangerous for the state not to take action against it.

Clipping provided by:

John Bailey &  
Associates Inc.  
Public Relations